



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,614	09/10/2003	Michael R. Smith	CIS0196US	5551
33031	7590	08/15/2007		
CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP 11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE BLDG. H, SUITE 250 AUSTIN, TX 78758			EXAMINER CHAI, LONGBIT	
			ART UNIT 2131	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/15/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/659,614

Applicant(s)

SMITH, MICHAEL R.

Examiner

Longbit Chai

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 55-74 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-32, 75-86 and 99-110 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 55-74 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Currently pending claims are 55 – 74.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to instant claims have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 102 that forms the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 55 – 60, 62, 63, 65 – 68 and 70 – 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cheng et al. (U.S. Patent 6,823,462).

As per claim 55, 65 and 70, Cheng teaches method comprising:

populating an access control list with a destination user group identifier, wherein said destination user group identifier identifies a destination user group of a destination (Cheng: Column 5 Line 31 – 38 and Column 6 Line 63 – 65: the group / category rules-based database is qualified as an access control list with a destination group name / ID that requires a common security policy with the source nodes to allow the data flows between the nodes),

Art Unit: 2131

said access control list comprises a source user group field configured to store a source user group identifier and a destination user group field configured to store a destination user group identifier, said source user group comprises a plurality of source network devices, said destination user group comprises a plurality of destination network devices (Cheng: Column 5 Line 36 – 38 and Column 6 Line 2 – 6 & Figure 5: the local ID is considered as the source group ID and the remote ID is interpreted as the destination group ID), and

said access control list is configured to allow said source user group identifier and said destination user group identifier to be compared (Cheng: Column 6 Line 63 – 65: only those source / destination group identifiers that match the same traffic profile policies are allowed to flow between the nodes).

As per claim 56, Cheng teaches said destination user group is assigned to said destination based on a role of said destination (Cheng: Column 7 Line 26 – 30: with respect to “security” role).

As per claim 57, Cheng teaches said populating is performed by a network device and comprises sending a request to another network device, and receiving a response from said another network device, wherein said response includes said destination user group identifier, and said destination user group identifier identifies said destination user group (Cheng: Column 7 Line 35 – 40 and Column 8 Line 5 – 6).

As per claim 58, 66 and 71, Cheng teaches comparing a user group of a packet with said destination user group (Cheng: Column 6 Line 63 – 65: only those source / destination

Art Unit: 2131

group identifiers that match the same traffic profile policies are allowed to flow between the nodes).

As per claim 59, 67 and 72, Cheng teaches said user group of said packet is a source user group, said destination user group is a user group of a destination of said packet, and said destination is said destination of said packet (Cheng: Column 5 Line 36 – 38 and Column 6 Line 2 – 6 & Figure 5: the local ID is considered as the source group ID and the remote ID is interpreted as the destination group ID that associates with a packet).

As per claim 60, Cheng teaches said source user group is assigned to a source of said packet based on a role of said source (Cheng: Column 7 Line 26 – 30: with respect to “security” role).

As per claim 62, 68 and 73, Cheng teaches determining said source user group; and determining said destination user group by looking up said destination user group in an access control list (Cheng: Column 5 Line 31 – 38 and Column 6 Line 63 – 65: the look-up table is considered as the group / category rules-based database, which is qualified as an access control list with a destination group name / ID that requires a common security policy with the source nodes to allow the data flows between the nodes).

As per claim 63, Cheng teaches said access control list is a role-based access control list (Cheng: Column 7 Line 26 – 30: i.e., “security” role based).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 61, 64, 69 and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. (U.S. Patent 6,823,462), in view of Li (U.S. Patent 6,711,172).

As per claim 61, Cheng teaches said destination user group is indicated by a destination user group and said source user group is indicated by a source user group identifier (Cheng: Column 5 Line 31 – 38 and Column 6 Line 63 – 65). However, Cheng does not teach a source user group identifier stored in said packet.

Li teaches a source user group identifier stored in said packet (Li: Column 4 Line 8 – 13: a pair of group / source address on the packet is used to route the packet).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Li within the system of Cheng because (a) Cheng teaches a means to identify a source user group by using a look-up table to match a source address with a source group identifier at a proxy-server network device (Cheng: Column 5 Line 31 – 38 and Column 6 Line 63 – 65) and (b) Li teaches proposing a more efficient method routing the packet from a source to group members by encoding a pair of group / source address directly on the packet (Li: Column 3 Line 34 – 42 / Line 20 – 23 / Line 1 – 4 and Column 4 Line 8 – 13).

Art Unit: 2131

As per claim 64, 69 and 74, Cheng teaches said source user group identifier identifies said source user group (Cheng: Column 5 Line 31 – 38 and Column 6 Line 63 – 65). However, Cheng does not teach extracting a source user group identifier from said packet.

Li teaches extracting a source user group identifier from said packet (Li: Column 4 Line 8 – 13: a pair of group / source address on the packet is used to route the packet and thereby, a source user group identifier can thus be extracted from the packet accordingly). See same rationale of combination applied herein as above in rejecting the claim 61.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Longbit Chai whose telephone number is 571-272-3788. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am-5:00pm.

Art Unit: 2131

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Longbit Chai
Examiner
Art Unit 2131



LBC

CHRISTOPHER REVAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER

